reply. Doc. #16. However, Weinstein's reply abandoned her previous grounds for remand and

raised several new issues regarding the sufficiency of the court's jurisdiction. Thereafter, Wells

25

26

Fargo filed the present motion to strike Weinstein's reply or for leave to file a sur-reply. Doc. #17. 1 **Discussion** 2 II. 3 The court recognizes that Weinstein has raised several new issues in her reply that have no 4 correlation to her initial motion to remand. Generally, a new issue cannot be raised for the first time 5 in a reply. See Northwest Acceptance Corp., 841 F.2d 918 (9th Cir. 1988); United States v. Birtle, 6 792 F.2d 846 (9th Cir. 1986). The reasoning behind this general rule is that by filing a reply brief which abandons the arguments asserted in the original motion, a plaintiff strips the defendant's 8 ability to respond to those new arguments. 9 In the motion to strike or leave to file a sur-reply, Wells Fargo outlines several arguments that it wishes to fully brief to the court. Accordingly, rather than striking the reply, the court shall 10 11 grant Wells Fargo leave to file a sur-reply. Wells Fargo shall have ten (10) days after the entry of 12 this order to file a sur-reply with the court that shall not exceed ten (10) pages in length. 13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant's motion to strike or for leave to file a sur-14 reply (Doc. #7) is GRANTED. 15 IT IS SO ORDERED. Alsihe DATED this 26th day of March, 2010. 16 17 18 19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 20 21 22 23 24 25 26